

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The final Office Action dated October 14, 2009 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 6 and 11 are hereby amended. Claims 5, 9, 10 and 15-17 are hereby canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the contents contained therein. No claims are added. Claims 4 and 12 were previously canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 6-8 and 11-13 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 and 5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Publication No. JP 409220399 to Miyashita et al. (hereinafter “*Miyashita et al.*”). *Office Action* at page 2. The rejection of claims 5, 9 and 10 is moot as claims 5, 9 and 10 are canceled herein. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the remaining claims and request reconsideration.

Independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “the drying stick is formed to be extended upward from the rack, and has an upper end bent in a “ \neg ” shape with a flat upper surface, or the dryer further comprises a seating plate at an end of the drying stick for seating the drying object thereon.” *Miyashita et al.* does not teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention.

Miyashita et al. discloses a “placing part 40a of a drying rack 40 ... extended in a stationary state in a drying chamber 4 formed by a drying drum is formed like a net, and an enclosure part 40b is erected on the peripheral edge part thereof.” *Miyashita* at Abstract and Fig. 3. *Miyashita* is entirely silent regarding any disclosure, express or inherent, concerning a “drying stick [that] is formed to be extended upward from the rack, and has an upper end bent in a “ \neg ” shape with a flat upper surface, or the dryer further comprises a seating plate at an end of the drying stick for seating the drying object thereon,” as recited in independent claim 1. Thus, *Miyashita et al.* does not disclose, expressly or inherently, all of the features as recited in independent claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of independent claim 1. Claims 2, 3 and 6-8 depend from independent claim 1. It stands to reason that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of those dependent claims should be withdrawn as well.

Claims 11 and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,546,771 to *Bonar* (hereinafter “*Bonar*”). *Office Action* at page 2. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration.

Independent claim 11 is allowable over the cited reference in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “the drying stick is detachably mounted to be projected upward from the seat and has an upper end bent in a “⊏” shape with a flat upper surface, or the dryer further comprises a seating plate at an end of the drying stick for seating the drying object thereon.” *Bonar* does not teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention.

Bonar discloses a “[d]ish holding basket 14 [that] is constructed of a plastic coated wire” with “[a] plurality of coated wire hoops 30 [that] are welded to uprights 32 in a spaced relationship.” *Bonar* at col. 2:40-41 and lines 44-46 and Fig. 2. In contrast, Applicants claim “the drying stick is detachably mounted to be projected upward from the seat and has an upper end bent in a “⊏” shape with a flat upper surface, or the dryer further comprises a seating plate at an end of the drying stick for seating the drying object thereon.” Thus, *Bonar* does not disclose, expressly or inherently, all of the features recited in independent claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of independent claim 11. Claims 13 and 14 depend from independent claim 11. It stands to reason that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of those dependent claims should be withdrawn as well.

CONCLUSION

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the

filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: January 14, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael I. Angert/

Michael I. Angert

Registration No.: 46,522

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant